[3]

THE

INTEREST

OF

GREAT BRITAIN,

RESPECTING THE

FRENCH WAR.

By WILLIAM FOX.

THE FOURTH EDITION, CORRECTED.

LONDON:

SOLD BY J. RIDGWAY, YORK STREET, ST. JAMES'S SQUARE;
T. WHIELDON AND BUTTERWORTH, FLEET STREET;
W. RICHARDSON, OPPOSITE THE ROYAL
EXCHANGE; AND M. GURNEY,
NO. 128, HOLBORN HILL.

1793.

(PRICE THREEPENCE, OR FIVE FOR A SHILLING.)
Where may be had, just published, by the same Author,
An Examination of Mr. Paine's Writings.
A Summary View of Evidence relating to the Slave Trade.
An Address to the People of Great Britain, 36th Edition.
Also Thoughts on the Death of the King of France, Price 3d.

AMONGST the peculiar circumſtances attending the French revolution; the moſt intereſting, and the moſt remarkable, is the general horror with which it is viewed by the European Monarchs, and the extenſive and powerful combination which has been formed amongſt them to ſuppreſs it. The terror it has produced ſeems to have totally abſorbed every other conſideration, to have united the moſt diſcordant intereſts, deſtroyed the moſt inveterate prejudices, and the moſt violent jealouſies. It has even driven the Pope to ſeek refuge in a nation, which has for more than two centuries had the misfortune to lie under his *interdict*, and to that monarch whoſe ſubjects he has moſt ſolemnly diſcharged from their allegiance to him. An inveſtigation into the cauſe of this political phenomenon may not be unintereſting, even excluſive of the important conſequences likely to reſult from it.

The revolt of ſubjects againſt their ſovereigns, is not a very rare occurence; the king of Great Britain has recently experienced an important one, by which he loſt the far greater part of his dominions, without exciting any very great concern amongſt his fellow monarchs, or any very powerful combination of them in his ſupport. Even republicaniſm has not heretofore appeared to excite any conſiderable alarm; *America*, *Holland*, *Switzerland*, nay, *England*, in the laſt century, renounced the authority of their ſovereigns, and formed republics, yet the monarchs of Europe abetted their revolt, and ſought their alliance. An antipathy to republicaniſm cannot be pretended, in this caſe, to be the motive for this confederacy againſt France, becauſe it exiſted at a time, when inſtead of dethroning their monarch, though intirely at their diſpoſal, they voluntarily left him a ſhare of power, dangerous to the ſafety and peace of the kingdom, and granted him a civil liſt to the utmoſt of his deſire, and much larger than that enjoyed by the king of England. Far leſs can the recent cruelties in France be deemed the cauſe, as thoſe were the effect, and not the cauſe of the royal confederacy. For when it was firſt formed, far leſs blood had been ſhed in France than in any revolution of equal importance, and a limited monarchy appeared to be peaceably

eſtabliſhed. No part of the abhorrence of the French revolution can therefore be attributed to the inſtability of the government, or the changes it has undergone, becauſe they were the natural conſequences of the hoſtile meaſures purſued againſt it. Mr. Pitt acknowledges, that the limited monarchy of France appeared to have been formed with the general concurrence of the people. Had that government then been left undiſturbed. Had not the king, the clergy, and nobles of France been tempted by the hope of powerful foreign aid, to endeavour the ſubverſion of the new formed government, its permanency, its peaceable eſtabliſhment, was far more promiſing than could reaſonably have been expected, from the nature of the convulſion, and the importance of the change which had taken place. All the calamities which have ſince appeared, and the perilous ſituation of the royal family of France, may therefore be far more properly attributed to Meſſrs. *Burke* and *Calonne*, who have been indefatigable in inciting the preſent clamour, than to the people of France.

At the time theſe men undertook the horrid taſk of inciting all Europe againſt that people, they had declared, that having obtained liberty with the ſword, they wiſhed to ſheath it for ever. They expreſsly diſclaimed any hoſtile deſign on the moſt defenceleſs ſtate; they did not appear to entertain any views inimical to the peace of the ſurrounding nations, nor the leaſt intention of interfering in their concerns. They appeared diſpoſed to ſit down peaceably, to enjoy the happineſs they expected to derive from the revolution they had effected. To us they were naturally led to look rather as allies, than as enemies; they conſidered us as the nation in Europe, whoſe government approximated the neareſt to that which they had recently eſtabliſhed; and when they ſaw the continent of Europe arming againſt them, they threw themſelves on our juſtice, and proffered us the office of mediator: when this was declined, when Mr. Burke was allowed to ſtigmatize them with impunity, when the French princes were inciting all Europe againſt them, when almoſt every European monarch appeared diſpoſed to attack them, and their king was ſuppoſed to be em-

ploying the immenſe revenue they had granted him in ſupporting theſe meaſures, we cannot much wonder at the rage of the French populace or its conſequences, nor will any man believe it to be the real reaſon of any meaſures which may be adopted againſt them. Indeed whatever may be the cataſtrophe of the royal family of France, or whatever may have been its origin, it can hardly be deemed a ſufficient cauſe for deluging Europe in blood. Tranſitions from the throne to an untimely grave, occur in almoſt every page of hiſtory, they enforce the argument of the moraliſt, embelliſh the works of the poet, and form the principle pathos of the drama. *In the ſpace of about half a century the blood of four queens, as beautiful and accompliſhed as the queen of France, ſtreamed on an Engliſh ſcaffold, and although it was an age of chivalry, not a ſword ſtarted from its ſcabbard to avenge them.* Even ſovereigns themſelves do not in general ſeem to poſſeſs very ſympathetic feelings, they rarely concern themſelves in the fate of thoſe fellow monarchs, with whom their own intereſts are not interwoven. The preſent age has ſeen a ſovereign precipitated from his throne to a priſon, and from thence to his tomb; not by injured ſubjects, but by her whom he had raiſed to empire, and who now ſways the bloody ſcepter, without having excited thoſe exclamations of horror which ſeem to have been reſerved for the preſent occaſion.

If a regard for the *Bourbons* be not the real motive for this confederacy, far leſs can we ſuppoſe it to be a concern for the people of *France*. Mr. Burke and his aſſociates, indeed, are extremely pathetic in lamenting the miſery which they have brought upon themſelves. That unhappy people! That miſerable, deluded, unfortunate country! are the epithets we apply to France; and it is perhaps the moſt extraordinary circumſtance, in this memorable event, that thirty millions of people ſhould ſo univerſally, and ſo pertinaciouſly perſiſt in being miſerable, and that it ſhould require ſuch very extraordinary means to compel them to be happy. It muſt be preſumed that the illuſtrious and beneficient monarchs of Ruſſia, of Pruſſia, and of Auſtria have placed their own ſubjects at the ſummit of happineſs, that they are thus ſo perfectly at leiſure to give happineſs to the people of another country. And

that the luminous geniuſes of Ruſſia of Brandenberg, and of Auſtria, have ſet out with ſwords in their hands to convince the French that they have miſtaken the road to felicity, and that the true principles of government, of ſocial order, and national proſperity, are not to be judged of by human reaſon, but to be adopted from the banks of the Wolga, the Don, and the Oder, where antient and venerable ſyſtems of government are eſtabliſhed, which were framed by the wiſdom of antient times, improved through a ſucceſſion of ages and ſanctioned by happy expeirence. But however powerfully the Ruſſian, Auſtrian, and Pruſſian armies may contend in favor of theſe ſyſtems, it becomes us to pauſe on the ſubject, becauſe it is poſſible the illuſtrious monarchs may be intereſted in the queſtion, and ſome perſons may be apt to ſurmiſe, that were the miſery reſulting from the French principles, real, the benevolent monarchs would have left theſe people undiſturbed, to have been as miſerable as they pleaſed, as a terrible example to deter ſurrounding nations, from ſubverting antient ſyſtems, or rebelling againſt their dread ſovereigns.

Let us then inquire a little into the nature of thoſe principles, which have cauſed ſuch univerſal alarm, and threaten ſuch univerſal miſchief. Firſt let us aſk what they are? " *Men being all free, equal, and indepen-*
" *dent, no one can be put out of his eſtate without his own*
" *conſent, by agreeing with other men to join and unite in a*
" *community.—Thus, that which begins, and actually con-*
" *cludes any political ſociety, is nothing but the conſent of a*
" *number of free men, capable of a majority to unite and*
" *incorporate into ſuch ſociety; and this is that, and that*
" *only, which did, or could, give beginning to any lawful*
" *government.—The ſupreme power cannot lawfully or*
" *rightly take from man, any part of his property without*
" *his own conſent.—There remains inherent in the people,*
" *a power to remove or alter the legiſlative, when they find*
" *the legiſlative act contrary to the truſt repoſed in them;*
" *for when ſuch truſt is abuſed, it is thereby forfeited, and*
" *devolves to thoſe who gave it.*"

Are theſe the principles of the French revolution? they are; but they ate not extracted from the paltry, blurred, ſcraps of *the Rights of Man*; they are taken

from the celebrated Mr. Locke's *Treatiſe on Government*, written avowedly for the purpoſe of defending the Engliſh revolution; and for writing of which, he was rewarded with a *thouſand* a year from the Britiſh government.

It ſhould ſeem then that theſe principles are not quite *new*, that the French philoſophers have not *invented* them; they have it ſeems for a *century* paſt curſed this country, and now they are fermenting and ſpreading their baneful effects through *Europe*. It is not then the principles themſelves, but it is theſe principles becoming *French*, which conſtitutes the danger; while they were confined to this foggy iſland, while they were locked up in a language almoſt unknown upon the continent, the monarchs of Europe were either ſtrangers to their exiſtence, or fearleſs of their effects. But when theſe principles are adopted by a nation, ſituated in the midſt of happy deſpotic monarchies; by a nation whoſe language is the univerſal language of Europe; and whoſe writers by their genius, their wit, their learning, and their taſte, had almoſt monopolized the literature of Europe; then it was that theſe principles excited their alarm, and threatened danger. The French writers have until lately been admired through *Europe*, patronized by *kings* and applauded by *nobles*. Some of them indeed were tinctured with *deiſm*, ſome even with *atheiſm*; but that did not ſeem much to diminiſh their celebrity, or draw down the indignation of the *monarchs* and *nobles* of *Europe*. But when theſe writers adopted the principles of Mr. *Locke*, when theſe principles began to operate, when the ſtate of France threatened an extenſive circulation of them. Then the alarm commenced; then it was diſcovered that the only writers in *Europe*, who were univerſally read, were a ſet of unhappy, miſerable philoſophers. That the only literary nation on the continent, were inadequate judges of their own happineſs, and that it was requiſite to ſend them *Ruſſian* and *Pruſſian* ſoldiers to teach it them.

Let it not be imagined that I mean to inſinuate, that theſe principles are not dangerous. Principles of *liberty*, whether *Engliſh*, *French*, or *Poliſh* certainly are dangerous to the *deſpots* of *Europe*, in proportion as they

are beneficial to their *ſubjects*; and that theſe deſpots ſhould unite to eradicate theſe principles, by deſtroying the new *Poliſh* and *French* governments is extremely natural. I only mean to diſpute the propriety of *our* joining the confederacy.

But probably I may be told that the *French* have introduced ſome new principles in addition to Mr. *Locke*'s. True, but theſe principles do not ſeem to be very miſchievous, or very hoſtile to human happineſs. *To renounce foreign conqueſts and aggreſſive war—To confine themſelves to the arts of peace, content with cultivating the ſoil, and improving the natural advantages heaven hath alloted them—To improve the human ſpecies by national education, thus attaching man to ſociety by enabling him to partake of its benefits, and apportioning human hnppineſs as equally as poſſible amongst human kind.* Theſe if errors, do not ſeem to be of a very atrocious nature, and ſhould they fail of being realiſed, it ought rather excite our *ſorrow* and *commiſeration*, than our *contempt*, our *indignation*, or our *vengeance*.

But it is ſaid, that in the *ſeeming* excellence of theſe principles, conſiſts their danger; that by theſe reveries of literary enthuſiaſts, mankind are induced to abandon a preſent and practicable ſtate of happineſs, in purſuit of a viſionary ſyſtem which never can be realized. If ſo, it became more peculiarly neceſſary that the French government ſhould have been left undiſturbed; that its impracticability and inutility might have been clearly manifeſted. Even the *Ruſſian peaſant* and the *German boor* might have been more content under their preſent deſpotiſm, had it appeared that the principles of the French revolution naturally led to a ſtate of anarchy, or a ſtate of deſpotiſm, more oppreſſive than their own; whereas the anarchy and diſorders of *France* may now be aſcribed to the obſtruction it has met with, and diſturbance it has received from foreign powers. Its advocates may now fairly contend—*Had the French government been left to its natural courſe, it would have produced a ſtate of human happineſs, ſuperior to what the world ever beheld. The deſpots knew it, they knew the contraſt it would form, to the miſery they ſpread around them. They reſolved to prevent its maturity, they combined to ſtrangle it in its birth. They attempted it, but in vain.*

—*And tho' defeated, and defeated in a manner that muſt deſtroy every hope of effecting its overthrow, yet they threaten renewed hoſtilities; and keep them in perpetual alarm, in hope their deluded ſubjects may believe, that the miſeries and calamities France endures from their machinations, are the conſequences of the government they have adopted.*

The continental potentates have confederated againſt *France*, not from any thing peculiar to her, either as to *principles*, *government*, or *conduct*; and whether we ſtand by a calm ſpectator of the deſtruction of *Poliſh* liberty, or join the continental powers in ſubverting the *French*; in either caſe, it is the *general* principles of liberty, and not any *particular modification* of them we are aſſiſting to deſtroy; and it is the *general* ſyſtem of tyranny which we in ſuch caſe neceſſarily ſupport.

That the *Auſtrian*, *Ruſſian*, and *Pruſſian* monarchs are to confederate with us to force upon *France*, the *Engliſh* Conſtitution, or any kind of free government, is too abſurd to be ſuppoſed. It is even not pretended by thoſe who have promoted this war. To our confederates, the *Engliſh* principles of government are as obnoxious as the *French*. *Poland* had formed a government ſimilar to our own; the neighbouring monarchs beheld it with abhorrence, conſpired to deſtroy it; and his majeſty of *Pruſſia*, after due deliberation, pronounced that *Poland* was contaminated with *French* principles, which he was determined to deſtroy. Theſe ſentiments we alſo apparently adopt, for with every diverſified ſyſtem of tyranny, with every ſpecies of arbitrary power, we can cordially coaleſce; we can confederate for mutual defence. But let *any* ſyſtem of liberty appear among the nations of *Europe*; let a form of government ariſe approximating to our own, with them we diſdain treaty or alliance: we look on them with *abhorrence*, or turn from them with *contempt*; we ſuffer them to be deſtroyed by the ſurrounding tyrants; and if their power proves inſufficient for the purpoſe, we at laſt join the confederacy to ſubvert them. *We* at leaſt cannot be accuſed of offering *confraternity*. We ally ourſelves with *any* government, provided it be hoſtile to freedom, but *liberty* and *happineſs*, it ſeems, we deem ſo eſtimable, that we keep them to ourſelves. To ſee the Britiſh arms otherwiſe employed, would

indeed be an uncommon circumſtance. The effects of our power and influence, are indeed to be very viſibly traced throughout every quarter of the globe, but alas! it is in one unvaried ſcene of *ſlavery*, *deſolation*, and *blood!* No wonder we look with abhorrence on the French principle of communicating to others that liberty they have themſelves obtained. It is a principle they certainly cannot be accuſed of having learned of us.

The intereſt the continental monarchs have in ſuppreſſing the principles of liberty, is plain and obvious; but let it be aſked, what intereſt have *we* therein? I will not aſk if his majeſty, as elector of *Hanover* has any! but it will not be eaſy to ſhew, that the *king* and *people* of *England* can poſſibly have any: to them it muſt be perfectly indifferent whether the principles of liberty exiſt on the *eaſt* or the *weſt* of the *Rhine*, or whether they be bounded by the *Alps* or the *Pyrennees*.

Yet it is the danger from theſe principles which is chiefly ſounded in our ears. It is their *principles* Mr. *Dundas* tells us, which has rendered France *obnoxious* and *dangerous*. And it is their *principles* Mr. *Burke* ſo vehemently calls on us, to wage *eternal war*, to eradicate.

The war then it ſeems is intended to ſubvert theſe principles? Diſmiſſing for a moment the enquiry, whether they be true or falſe, dangerous or beneficial; let us aſk a plain queſtion, *How a war with the French republic is to deſtroy them? England* is their native land; here they may be deemed indigenous, in *France* only exotic; and whether ſuffered to remain, or whether the hand of violence tears up the new planted offset, the mother plant ſtill remains. *Here* if any where, *that* muſt be deſtroyed: not only Mr. *Burke*'s ſpeeches and the Duke of *Richmond*'s letters, but Mr. *Locke*'s writings muſt be conſigned to oblivion before the principles of the *French* revolution can be annihilated. They are not merely the principles of *that* revolution, but of *all* our modern revolutions. Mr. *Locke* reduced them into form for the *Engliſh* revolution; Mr. *Molyneux* reſorted to them as a proper foundation for an *Iriſh* revolution; Mr. *Burke*'s coadjutor, Dr. *Price* brought them forward for the *American*, and the national

aſſembly adopted them for the *French* revolution. They are ſtill very little the worſe for wear, and may ſerve for twenty revolutions more. It is true thoſe who have uſed them to effect a revolution, have uſually wiſhed, as ſoon as the end has been anſwered, to conſign them to oblivion; yet they ſurvive. Admitting then theſe principles to be *dangerous in the extreme*; admitting alſo that their progreſs in this nation be *rapid* and *alarming:* nay, that all the exertions of government will be inadequate to preſerve the public peace from the diſorders that theſe principles will occaſion. Still we muſt requeſt Mr. *Dundas*, Mr. *Burke*, or Mr. *Jenkinſon* to inform us how a *war* will eradicate theſe principles, or prevent their further progreſs amongſt us? *Suppoſing the Anſtrian and Pruſſian grenadiers, with the aſſiſtance of the Engliſh guards, were to eat up thirty millions of French, and bring away the eighty-three Departments in their knap-ſacks; would theſe principles be loſt? would the murder of thirty millions of people prove them to be falſe? or would any calamities the French may endure from the hand of violence make theſe principles be leſs admired?* If it be intended to root them out, meaſures very diſferent indeed from thoſe avowed muſt be adopted.

Should we indeed ever be informed that we have ſucceeded in reſtoring the antient French monarchy to its former luſtre, and that the national convention have been all ſent to a new *Baſtile*, erected on purpoſe to receive them. Should we be told that the Britiſh arms had turned the ſcale, and determined the war in favor of the allied monarchs, that they had determined no longer to quarrel about the boundaries of their territories; but, from a ſenſe of common danger had aſſociated together againſt their ſubjects as their common enemy; I know not but ſome inquiſitive perſons amongſt us might be apt to enquire the names of the allied kings; and probably might be fooliſh enough to imagine, that if ever we ſhould have an enterpriſing monarch on the throne, our liberties might be in rather more danger from the nations of *Europe* being governed by deſpotic monarchs, who had effectually ſubjugated their *ſubjects*, and had large ſtanding armies at their abſolute diſpoſal, than if theſe nations were all democratic republics.—And it is not undeſerv-

ing notice, that ſhould the French revolution be ſuppreſſed, the *European monarchs* will have learnt a leſſon from it they will not ſoon forget. Mr. *Burke* juſtly obſerves that *kings* will be deterred from granting their ſubjects any degree of liberty; they will from policy be cruel. Should the continental monarchs ſucceed in ſuppreſſing the French revolution, they will hardly make Mr. *Burke* a lying prophet. Tyrants are cruel in proportion to their fears.

Perhaps it will be ſaid, we do not mean to reſtore the old government of *France*. Indeed it is not eaſy to ſurmiſe what is really meant by the *farrago* of incoherent complaints againſt *France* with which we are deafened; but certainly as moſt of them are *philippicks* againſt the *new* government, the only plain inference is, that this *abominable* government is to be deſtroyed, and as we ſhould reaſonably ſuppoſe, the *old* one to be reſtored: certainly it appears to be intended to compel them to have a *king*. Mr. *Burke*'s moſt *vehement* complaint is, that they hate *kings*. The meaſures which have been purſued againſt them, do not ſeem indeed to have been extremely well calculated to remove their antipathy; and ſhould the king of *England* join the confederacy againſt them, it is not quite certain that it will totally eradicate their ſtrange prejudices againſt *kings*. To make them love kings will certainly be rather a difficult taſk; the utmoſt we ſhall be able to effect, will be to compel them to ſwallow a *king*, which they will diſgorge if ever it be in their power.

It is peculiar to this war, that our moſt imminent danger may poſſibly reſult from *ſucceſs*. Can we believe it poſſible, that the monarchs of Europe, after we have aſſiſted them to eradicate theſe principles out of *France*, will ſuffer them to exiſt in *England?* Muſt not this country have the benefit of their *kind* attention? The Engliſh language is becoming common on the continent, and they will hardly overlook the danger which may reſult from it, nor is it to be imagined that if the continent be thoroughly ſubjugated, *England* can inſure her exemption from the yoke. Hence if it were to be ſuppoſed poſſible, that the *Royal Aſſociation* ſhould totally ſubvert the new government of France, we might juſtly entertain the moſt dreadful apprehenſions. The

continental monarchs no longer engaged in endleſs quarrels about the boundaries of their dominions, but combined together in one horrid confederacy to maintain their power againſt their *ſubjects*; all principles of benefit and importance to mankind would be eradicated. *Europe would preſent to our view a new and a monſtrous ſyſtem of government indeed, far more deteſtable than the old.* One ſtagnant and putrid maſs of deſpotiſm would hang over the whole continent. Then indeed the plan would preſent to our view a grand unity of deſign. It would not appear as it now does, in unconnected and disjointed parts. If this be a part of the plan, it is carefully and prudently kept out of ſight. We are told nothing of reciprocity. The king of *England* is to engage in this conteſt from pure motives of regard to his fellow monarchs; to preſerve *their* dignity and power, as *king of England*; at leaſt, he aſks nothing for himſelf.

But as there is little chance that *theſe* principles, whether *French* or *Engliſh*, will ever be rooted out, it may be ſome comfort to thoſe who are alarmed about them, to be informed that however dangerous or however beneficial they may be in *Germany*; yet in *England* they are unimportant. As principles they have long exiſted in this country: they have been appealed to in both the *Engliſh* and *American* revolutions; but that they had any tendency to produce theſe events may be doubted. If the *Engliſh*, the *Iriſh*, the *Scotch*, or the *Welſh* ſhould ever feel apprehenſions ſufficient to induce them to revolt, and ſhould have it in their power to effect it, they may poſſibly reſort to *theſe* principles, if they are to be found; but were they to be loſt, that circumſtance certainly would not reſtrain them from revolt: they would do as we did at the revolution, firſt effect it, and then find ſome Mr. *Locke* to form a ſet of principles to defend it. In the mean time there is little danger of our reſorting to them, but as themes of literary diſcuſſion. Perhaps the Duke of *Richmond* and a few whimſical men may wiſh to ſee *theſe* principles more obviouſly realiſed in our government; but to go to war with the *French* for that reaſon, is as abſurd as if we were to commence a cruſade againſt the *Turks*, becauſe a few individuals amongſt us may admire the *Koran*; or

againſt the idolatrous *Chineſe*, becauſe an extravagant author has lately expreſſed his approbation of the *Heathen Theology*.

The people of this country in a ſituation of increaſing proſperity, ſurrounded with comparative miſery, will not be eaſily induced to hazard this happineſs: they will not ſcrutinize accurately into our form of government; nor hazard a public convulſion, by attempting ſuch ſpeculative, or even real improvements as may endanger the public peace. Some few always have been, and always will be endeavouring to draw the public notice by their ſpeculations, but the bulk of the nation will give but little heed to them. If ever there be the leaſt danger of their interrupting the public happineſs, we ſhall ſtop our buſineſs and our pleaſures for a moment, and convince them of their inſignificance. That the public peace was in any danger from theſe principles could hardly be believed; *and cannot be now even pretended.* The public have manifeſted ſuch an univerſal approbation of the government and its adminiſtration, and ſuch a determination to ſupport it, as was never before witneſſed: all *parties*, all *religions*, all *ranks*, merely on being informed, by authority, that the public peace was in danger, have with unexampled zeal, preſſed forward to expreſs their attachment, without even ſtopping to enquire whether the danger be *real* or *imaginary*. Is this a time to tell us of danger from public commotions? If any man really thought ſo, he muſt be convinced of his miſtake; and it is certainly a little inconſiſtent in Mr. *Burke*, that he repreſents us as cleaving to our antient prejudices, becauſe they are prejudices, yet conſiders us as ready to run mad after the moſt extravagant innovations; the baneful and miſchievous effects of which, he ſays, we have an example of, in the miſery they have brought on the French nation. But admitting there were ſome ground to apprehend danger from *republicans* and *levellers*, the meaſures which have been taken, appear to have been fully adequate to the purpoſe: if *libellers* write, *juries* will convict, and *courts* will puniſh: if *riots* ſhould happen, *conſtables* or *ſoldiers* will ſuppreſs them. Theſe ſeem to be the *proper*, we have experienced them to be

adequate, and they certainly are *cheaper* remedies for the evil, than a *war* againſt *France*.

As none of the principles of the French revolution can be refered to as being either new or dangerous. Mr. *Burke* to ſtigmatize it, talks for hours, about *blood* and *atheiſm*, and then to produce *ſtage effect* throws daggers about the houſe; but after he has finiſhed his *theatric rant*, he muſt be told, that the circumſtances attending a revolution, are not its *principles*, and frequently not the *reſult* of the principles. The maſſacre of *Glencoe*, or *King William's bloody wars*, our *national debt*, the *ſeptennial* or *riot act*, were never called the *principles* of the *Engliſh revolution*. The events of *Auguſt* and *September* aroſe from foreign cauſes; had thoſe cauſes not exiſted, the events would not have followed; yet the *principles* of the revolution would have been the ſame; ſo the *hatred* to *kings* conſtitutes no part of thoſe principles, it ſprang from the hatred *kings* have manifeſted to their government. The offer of *confraternity* was adopted to counteract the univerſal *confederation* they ſaw formed againſt them, or at leaſt to retaliate it; and had the *confederation* never been formed, there is not the leaſt evidence to prove, that either *hatred to kings*, or the offer of *confraternity* would have reſulted from their principles, any more than from the principles of any other republic, or than from the principles of *our* revolution, for even *that* has been diſgraced with *blood*, and ſtigmatized with *atheiſm*. The reſiſtance of our anceſtors to the *antient* authority of the crown, during the reigns of the *Stuarts*, was attended with much *blood-ſhed*, and produced ſome *ridiculous*, and ſome *diſgraceful* circumſtances. In preſerving the *new* line of kings, and the *new* ſpecies of monarchy, ſince 1688, we have ſhed no ſmall quantity of *blood*, both in *Ireland* and in *Scotland*; and under circumſtances, which, Mr. *Burke*, ſhould he ever be diſpoſed to undertake the taſk, might poſſibly be able to place in as *odious* a point of view, as he has the *French maſſacrees*.

As to both *atheiſm* and *murder* they are not new charges againſt revolution principles. Mr. *Burke* is only a *copyiſt*; he merely *ecchos* the decrees of the univerſity of Oxford juſt prior to *our* revolution. When

having carefully examined the principles of thoſe very revolutioniſts, whoſe conduct and whoſe writings, even Mr. *Burke* affects to revere; that celebrated ſeat of piety and learning, ſolemnly decreed, that "the ſaid "propoſitions were *falſe, ſeditious, impious, heretical,* and "*blaſphemous,* injurious to *Chriſtianity,* and deſtructive "of all government in *church and ſtate,* fitted to *deprave* "*good manners,* corrupt the minds of uneaſy men, ſtir "up *ſeditions* and *tumults,* and lead to *rebellions, murder* "*of princes,* and *atheiſm* itſelf." And about the ſame time one of the moſt learned and reſpectable of our biſhops had ſagacity enough to diſcover *atheiſm* in Mr. *Locke*'s writings.

But however dangerous, or however atheiſtical theſe principles might then be deemed, we now ſeem deſirous of monopolizing them; and the oppoſition to the French revolution, ariſes in no ſmall degree, from an apprehenſion that other nations may derive the ſame benefit from them which we have experienced. Much is it to be lamented that in this country there are many, who, fraught with national pride, caſt a jaundiced eye around and ſay, *If the nations of Europe enjoy the ſweets of liberty, and their commerce ceaſes to be expoſed to arbitrary laws adminiſtered by venal judges;—if their land no longer lies uncultivated, that their nobles may enjoy the pleaſures of the chace;—if myriads of clergy draw not away their wealth from the channels of induſtry;—if arbitrary and rapacious exaction no longer rob the artiſan and the peaſant of the fruit of their induſtry, or violence force them from their families, to fill up the ravages of death in the armies of contending deſpots; then thoſe nations, poſſeſſed of ſuperior natural advantages to ourſelves, will rear their heads around us; no longer ſhall we retain our proud preeminenence, or hold the equilibrium of empire; confined to the natural advantages our iſland poſſeſſes, we ſhall ceaſe to carry on half the commerce of Europe; no more will the Britiſh name carry terror through the world, or its terrors reſound from pole to pole.* But let ſuch recollect—that if patriotiſm be a virtue, it cannot be founded on ſuch malignant propenſities; it will not lead us to wiſh human happineſs to be circumſcribed by *Albion*'s *Cliffs,* or that the genius of Liberty ſhould caſt her mantle only o'er our iſle.

But admitting the overthrow of the old government in France, may, by increaſing its *trade*, *agriculture*, and *manufactures*, be at ſome diſtant period, prejudicial to our own: admitting alſo, that on this malignant principle we did not ſcruple to act; yet on the mere *impolicy* of it we may ſafely reſt the queſtion, even under any circumſtances which can poſſibly take place.

To re-eſtabliſh the old government, we may now certainly reckon amongſt the impoſſibilities: had that been in contemplation, we ſhould have attempted it earlier, when the *Auſtrian* and *Pruſſian* armies were in full ſtrength, undiminiſhed by *ſickneſs* and *ſlaughter*, and undiſmayed by *defeat*, when their exchequers were not exhauſted, and when they would not have reſted ſolely on *us* for their ſupply; even then, no man can imagine that our weight thrown into the ſcale would have turned the ballance; our importance as a *military* power is certainly not great, and where the combined armies of *Auſtria* and *Pruſſia* have had ſo ſhameful a repulſe ours would hardly have made much impreſſion: we might to be ſure, have ſent a few regiments to be cut off at St. *Cas*, to be ſlaughtered in the fields of *Fontenoy*, or to ſign a capitulation at *Cloſter-Seven*; and we may *now* repleniſh the exhauſted coffers of the German princes, to enable them to obſtruct the progreſs of republicaniſm in *Germany*, for to overthrow it in *France* they can have now no hope. But may it not be aſked, what intereſt can we have in this? What concern have we whether republicaniſm prevail on the banks of the *Rhine*, the *Wolga*, the *Danube*, or the *Po?* If the change of the government of *France* will be advantageous to its *trade* and *manufactures*, and thereby become injurious to *ours*, it is an evil we muſt prepare to meet, it cannot be prevented. *France* is an eſtabliſhed republic, and there, if any where, we muſt expect to ſee riſing and flouriſhing manufactories; but from *Germany*, remote indeed muſt be any ſuch danger: to improve her uncultivated ground will afford employment for an increaſing population, and long prevent her engaging in extenſive manufactures to our prejudice, and in the mean time they will be taken of us in an increaſing proportion. *Germany* is even *now* the *beſt* market we have: will ſhe become a worſe, when *rich*, *populous*, *free*,

and *happy?* when her foreſts ſhall be converted into cultivated villages, full of inhabitants, enjoying the comforts, perhaps the ſuperfluities of life, ſhall we not find an additional ſource of trade? If there be an event to be wiſhed for by us of more peculiar importance than any other, it is that *Germany be free*, and in connection with it, that the *Scheldt* be opened; the Britiſh veſſels will then unload our manufacttures on the quays of *Antwerp*, from whence they will be conveyed by the *Flemiſh canals, Rhine*, &c. to the interior parts of *Europe:* if there be a nation to whom the opening the port of *Antwerp* muſt be highly advantageous, it is *England*; if there be a nation to whom (except *Holland*) it will be injurious, it is *France*; they are giving to *Flanders* a port far ſuperior to any one they themſelves poſſeſs in the channel; yet even to *Flanders* is it unimportant, in compariſon of us, for of *Engliſh* manufactures chiefly, *Antwerp* will become the *depot*.

Wars, when commenced, even on popular ground, and originating in the public voice, have uſually a different termination. *Ideal* benefits are in general held out, but they always vaniſh when the *great* and *certain* evils of war come to be experienced! But in this war, not only every reflecting man will know its impolicy and abſurdity, but what is of much more importance, no object can poſſibly be held out to deceive the ignorant multitude: ſhould they be even told that the large ſubſidies ſent by us to the continent had been ſo well employed by our *illuſtrious* allies, that the armies of the German potentates, and the Ruſſian empreſs had been crowned with the moſt complete ſucceſs, that French principles had been effectually eradicated out of *France* and *Poland*, and their *antient* and *venerable* governments *reſtored, eſtabliſhed*, and *ſecured*, from the deteſtable innovations of *reaſon* and *philoſophy*: yet perhaps ſome may ſay, the mad and boundleſs *ambition* of the court of France had been ſounded in our ears for above a century, it had been repreſented as endangering the peace and liberties of mankind; to it we attributed our *wars*, our *taxes*, our *national debt*, our *ſtanding army*, and *expenſive navy*. This power, Mr. *Burke* told us no longer exiſted as a nation, its army without diſcipline, its finances ruined. he could

only ſee a vaſt *chaſm*, which once was *France*. And is our commerce ruined, our taxes and national debt increaſed? are we involved in all the calamities of war, to fill up this *chaſm*, to *reſtore* this dreadful and dangerous power, to give diſcipline to its armies, and *order* and *energy* to its government? Did you regret that this *dangerous* government lay before you an object of commiſeration and contempt? or was the danger only *ideal*, and you regreted that there no longer exiſted a pretence for perpetual war, accumulated taxes, and a ſtanding army?

Indeed it is ſcarcely poſſible that this war can have been projected for any of the avowed purpoſes; certainly not to keep principles out of this kingdom which were in it before the French revolution took place, and will ſtill exiſt, whether the French government *ſtand* or *fall*. The war can hardly be intended to reſtore the *old* government of France, for that, even if practicable, would be expoſing ourſelves to a *known* evil: It cannot be intended to give France a *good* government, for that would be injurious to our *trade* and *manufactures*; nor a *bad* one, for that we are told ſhe has already: it is hardly intended to engage in a war, to block up Antwerp from our *own* ſhipping, nor to prevent *Germany*, *Italy*, *Ruſſia*, or *China* from becoming republics, which can certainly do *us* no hurt: and a war can hardly be intended for ſecuring the liberty of the *Geneveſe*, the ſnowy Alps to *Sardinia*, or the caſtle of St. *Angelo* to the Pope: we are hardly going to mount our *Rozinante*, to redreſs all the wrongs, and engage all the windmills in the world.

The motives for this war may be various—While *the true born Engliſhmen* are frantic with *hatred of the French*, and the *king* terrified with the danger of *Hanover*; the intrigues of a divided cabinet may have produced the preſent ferment for private purpoſes, and the miniſter may at length be propelled (as other miniſters have been) into a war, which threatens to be as deſtructive to his popularity, as to the proſperity of the nation; and as no miniſter, who commenced a war, ever yet terminated it, we ſhall probably have to innumerate amongſt the evils of this war, the loſs of a miniſter, who has juſtly obtained the confidence and eſteem of his country.——*FINIS*.